DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 442 08 VT 014 533

AUTHOR Soong, Robert K.; And Others
TITLE New Careers from Legislation to Administration. Career Options Research and Development.
INSTITUTION YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago, Ill. Career Options Research and Development (CORD).
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Division of Comprehensive and Vocational Education.
BUREAU NO BR-7-0329
PUB DATE Sep 71
GRANT OEG-0-8-7-0329-3694(085)
NOTE 17p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Disadvantaged Groups; *Federal Government; Federal Legislation; *Financial Support; *Guidelines; *Human Services; Models; *Program Administration; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS New Careers

ABSTRACT

Discussed in this document are problems encountered primarily with the Federal bureaucracy when implementing innovative job training programs for the poor. With the focus on implementing and administering New Careers programs funded by Congress, the document offers a rationale for ensuring consistancy between legislative rhetoric and administrative beha ior. Also included is an advisory model of "grantsmanship" to ensure productive and sustained administration of programs and services funded under Acts of Congress. This model includes provisions for a guarantee of workmanship and performance, a one-to-one accountability, program auditing, and stated objectives. (JS)

BR 7-0329
PA 08
VT
OE NCERD

ED 058442

NEW CAREERS

FROM LEGISLATION

TO ADMINISTRATION

September 1971

VT014533

CORD
Career Options
Research and Development

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEH REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NEW CAREERS

FROM LEGISLATION

TO ADMINISTRATION

September 1971

CORD
Career Options
Research and Development

CAREER OPTIONS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, Project No. 7-0329, was supported by the U.S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Research and Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, under Section 4(c) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, in a grant to the YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN CHICAGO, 19 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60603.

This document was prepared by the staff of Career Options Research and Development:

Robert K. Soong, Executive Director
Jean Wetzel, Associate Director
Barry Warren, Program Director
Jeanette B. Hall, Program Director
George A. Kich, Program Assistant

as a supporting Advisory Document to the Final Report for the three-year project, 1968-1971.

Contractors undertaking projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinion do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education or YMCA position or policy.

Legislation is not the same as administration. Intention is not the same as action. Principle is not the same as practice. The Act of Congress that provides money for research and development is not the same as the effective action that actually results in New Careers for the poor. New Careers legislation has made possible thousands of jobs for non-credentialed people. Such legislation includes the Scheuer Amendment, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Manpower Development and Training Act, Vocational Education Amendments, Economic Opportunities Act, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, Juvenile Delinquency Control Act, Educational Professions Act, Higher Education Amendments, and so on. Theoretically, these pieces of legislation enable existing funds that were earmarked for the payment of professional salaries to be used for the upgrading and expansion of paraprofessional positions allowing for job mobility and career opportunities through education and training.

In the summer of 1968, New Careerists across the country began to discover that their New Careers were part of a "no-opportunity system." Here is the problem as they themselves have stated it.

> ". . .In the United States there are millions of disgruntled people who take little or no part, at least through socially accepted channels, in determining their own destinies. For a number of reasons, they cannot negotiate in the American opportunity structure. They do not have the relevant knowledge or skills which are necessary to fit in, taking things as they are. This does not mean that these people are not busy. Some are underemployed and underpaid, and cannot take time away from work to upgrade their skills or even respond to a classified advertisement which promises better conditions and more pay. Some cannot find or hold employment and spend inordinate amounts of time arguing with landlords, visiting welfare offices, bench-sitting in hospital dispensaries, or travelling back and forth to the offices of officialdom trying to arrange a pass to a relative in a correctional institution. These are their daily preoccupations. Others, deeper in the morass of the no-opportunity system, are inventing opportunities which are considered illegal "downtown", for example, making books, receiving stolen property, running numbers, carrying packages or contents of which they do not ask about, etc. Regardless of the variety of forced adjustment, people survive. But there is little growth and little dignity." (Prospectus, the National Association of New Careerists, Inc., September, 1969.)

The New Careers philosophy suggests hope for people trapped in the kinds of situations outlined above, and so the National Association of New Careerists

has dedicated itself to making this philosophy a reality.

All the Acts of Congress which support the New Careers concept intend to hire people first, then train and educate them for jobs which can become truly productive careers--opportunities with personal satisfaction and societal benefits. But in spite of these good intentions, the opposite situation has resulted. By late 1969, the American economy had slowed down. Unemployment was going up, and the underemployment threatened the New Careerists. All good and noble legislation to the contrary, the administrators of New Careers program had failed their beneficiaries in several ways.

1. The administration failed to request adequate, and in some cases *any*, appropriation for such key programs as the New Careers sections of the Vocational Rehabilitation and Vocational Education Acts, or for Title IX (Education for Public Service) of the Higher Education Act.
2. The Labor Department weakened the New Careers program guidelines, especially the education component. For example, provision was made to reduce the time spent in the education of trainees in the second year. This means more make-work programs to absorb more bodies, and less commitment to training and education for careers.
3. The Scheuer Amendment put into effect the planned reduction of funds for New Careers for Fiscal Year 1971. This means that fewer New Careerists can be hired.
4. The Office of Economic Opportunity and other major governmental offices continually fail to require career advancement as a part of their own staff development or of the community action programs which they support.

Something had to be done about these conditions. In September of 1969, the New Careerists sought to confront the key administrators of New Careers legislation: James Farmer, Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (supervisor of all New Careers programs); Don Davies, Associate Commissioner, Office of Education, HEW; Arnold Weber, Assistant Secretary of Labor; Charles Odell, Director, Office of Manpower Support, Manpower Administration, Department of Labor; Donald Rumsfeld, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity; Donald Wertman, Deputy Director, OEO. The New Careerists' demands for immediate implementation were:

1. Involvment of New Careerists in "in-house" and "out-of-house" staffing and use of New Careerists in advisory capacities. This request was based on the fact that the current decision-making structure is biased in favor of people who hold masters and doctoral degrees.
2. Realistic guidelines for career development. If such guidelines are not established and enforced, New Careers programs will amount to nothing more than a series of dead-end jobs.
3. Relvant career-oriented education, both on the secondary and post-secondary levels, so that advancement is possible.
4. Realistic career ladders that would reflect change in job responsibilities and tasks, not just change of title or salary.
5. Realistic funding for planning and implementation.
6. Release time from jobs for training, so that further education is systematic rather than on a catch-as-catch-can basis.
7. Recognition for life and work experience, instead of only for classroom work, in career advancement.
8. Provision for on-the-job training as well as other supportive services.
9. Community control of New Careers programs enabling them to operated independently of state and city governments.
10. Consolidation of New Careers programs. In HEW alone, there are thirty-five existing New Careers programs and forty more potential ones.

The responses of the government administrators ranged from serious listening and negotiation toward tangible results to bureaucratic playfulness. In meeting with Secretary James Farmer and his assistant, Don Wendell, the New Careerists wanted to convey their interest in (1) the selection of the Advisory Council to the Office of New Careers, in order to establish more decision-making powers for New Careerists, and (2) obtaining a "sign-off" power for New Careers programs that received HEW funds, establishing community control to operate independently of city and state governments. Mr. Farmer discussed in depth several possibilities for selecting New Careerists. The group requested a firm commitment from him to support the role of the New Careerists Association, and Mr. Farmer committed himself in the following manner:

1. The Office stated that it fully intended that the New Careerists Association would play a large role in the determination of the

selection process for the total Advisory Council.

2. The National New Careerists Association should select or approve all New Careerists who are to sit on the Council.
3. Expenses for serving on the Advisory Council would be paid for by the Office of New Careers.
4. Since the Nominating Committee had not been formed, and the proportion of New Careerists on the Council was not yet undetermined, Mr. Farmer directed Mr. Wendell to meet with the president of the National New Careerists Association on that matter at the earliest time.
5. Regarding "sign-off" power, Mr. Wendell stated that for the thirty-four programs already identified as New Careers programs, establishing the sign-off would probably be impossible as this would have to be written into the legislation (as in Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act). Realistically, it could not become a reality, because even private organizations are not entitled to such power, nor are labor unions. However, for the forty or so upcoming programs that indicate New Careers potential, the sign-off power is a possiblity.

The meeting with Secretary Farmer and staff concluded with an agreement to further delineate the questions of power, authority, and mutual accountability in the functioning of New Careers programs. Again, Mr. Farmer assured the New Careerists that the mission of his office was to improve services, create career opportunities, liberalize licensing requirements, and support education and training in terms of career development.

The experience with James Farmer contrasts greatly with the New Careerists' visit to Donald Rumsfeld, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The setting: an OEO conference room, crammed wall-to-wall with people--three hundred of them.

New Careerist:	We're tired of talking to delegate agencies of the OEO. We want to see Mr. Rumsfeld himself.
Top Aide:	Mr. Rumsfeld is not in. But if you'll present your demands and discuss them with us, we'll do our best to direct them to his attention.
Careerist:	Just one question. Where is Mr. Rumsfeld.
Aide:	Don't know.

Careerist: What?

Aide: I honestly don't know.

Careerist: If Richard Milhaus Nixon calls Rumsfeld would you say you don't know? Now, we are citizens of the United States. We want to know where Mr. Rumsfeld is.

Aide: We're trying to locate him, but we haven't found him yet. Why don't we proceed in an orderly way. . .

Careerist: Bull shit. All we want to know is where Mr. Rumsfeld is, so we can help you find him. We got all day here to wait for your answer.

(This actually went on for more than thirty minutes. Because of the limited space in the conference room, it soon became hot, sweaty, and smelly. Remember, three hundred people.)

Aide: We didn't expect so *many* of you.

Careerist: You expected one or two respectable-looking, high-paid fat-cats to come for some expensive luncheon and beg for some money. We come looking for our rights as United States citizens, and you better change that attitude of yours.

(The crowd was becoming impatient and ugly. Someone yelled, "Pigs are coming," referring to the security guards. There was booing and moaning. Nobody moved, because there was no room to move. Those close to the door would not move, otherwise they would lose what little chance they had for the all-important confrontation with Mr. Anti-Poverty. Then in came a youthful-looking fellow in shirt-sleeves and tie. He picked up a microphone and said, "I'm Don Rumsfeld, Director of the OEO." The room was instantaneously filled with cheers, whistles, and applause, while the shirt-sleeved young man beamed with boyish glee.)

Careerist: Mr. Rumsfeld, where were you?

Mr. Rumsfeld: Oh, I was just next door, and I heard some people. . .(Laughter drowned out the rest of his sentence.)

A list of demands were presented. Among them were requirements for OEO-supported Community Action Programs to include career

development; to provide college supplementary training for employees; to utilize paraprofessionals in legal services; and to allow New Careerists to participate in the decision-making procedures of the OEO. Mr. Rumsfeld felt that he could not respond immediately, but would formally reply, point by point, within sixty days.

What were the results of this interview with Mr. Rumsfeld? As late as the spring of 1971 the New Human Services Newsletter (Vol. 1, No. 2, Winter, 1970) reported the following:

> Recent visits by the New Careers Legislative Task Force to a number of government agencies indicate how good legislation becomes no program at all
>
> Some of the earliest new careers programs were funded under the Kennedy-sponsored Juvenile Delinquency Prevention legislation. In 1968, new JD legislation was passed with specific new careers language. However, a meeting with Deputy Commissioner Turner indicates nothing has been done to implement these provisons.
>
> Two new careers sections were incorporated into the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments. These programs have not been funded or implemented, according to Dr. Rumpf. In fact, although the Congress appropriated the money, the Administration has failed to release the $17.5 million for Voc Ed research which includes the new careers programs.
>
> Things were somewhat better at the Rehabilitation Service Administration where nine Voc Rehab new careers grants were made in FY 1970, under the 1968 law. Although twice the money is available in FY 1971, it is not clear according to an interview with James Taylor as to whether they plan to do anything more than refund the already operating programs.

Meanwhile, James Farmer resigned from his post, frustrated, for he could no longer "chafe in the ponderous bureaucracy." Don Rumsfeld went upwards, to become presidential counselor. Major administrative agencies such as HEW, Labor, and OEO have been undergoing reorganization--regionalizing, transferring, adding, and deleting responsibilities. Unemployment has reached the decade's all-time high of 6.4 percent (higher among minorities), and job prospects for New Careerists and students are at an all-time low.

On the local scene, the administrative bungles hit even closer to home. For example, both the Illinois State and Cook County Departments of Public Aid, along with the "benign neglect" of HEW, have failed to implement,

under Public Law No. 90-248, a state plan for the employment, education, and training of paraprofessionals, effective July 1, 1969. In March of 1970, the State Department of Public Aid imposed a freeze on hiring while returning $4 million to the state treasury. Meanwhile, the average caseload ranged as high as 150 cases per worker, which is 90 cases over the federal limit. Even legally qualified families whose needs are desperate, still have to wait as long as six months for service. In November, 1970 the U.S. District Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled the state and county action unconstitutional under the equal protection clause. This now obligated the Departments of Public Aid to employ welfare recipients for paraprofessional positions, with supportive education and training for career growth.

However, the minimum qualifications for the Case Aide position are unreasonable. The qualifications are as follows:

High school diploma or GED (General Education Development); also, two years of college is desirable

PLUS

Two years of full-time paid experience as:

Public Aid Case Aide Trainee with Cook County Department of Public Aid (Since this position was just recently established, no one qualifies at this time.);

OR Clerical employee with Cook County Department of Public Aid;

OR Teacher in accredited grammar school, high school, or licensed day care center;

OR Registered nurse;

OR Community worker in an agency providing helping services to individuals and families.

Besides meeting the above qualifications, there are other requirements.

1. You must know that there is such a thing as a case aide, and then know when, where, and how to apply.
2. You must travel to 118 North Clark Street, Room 935, to get the application form and questionnaire. (Bus fare: $1.10)
3. You must gather all information requested, and fill out application and questionnaire regarding loyalty to the government, extent to which one uses intoxicating liquors or dope, and whether one resigned after the employer intended to discharge. (Applications which are not completely filled out will be rejected.)

4. You then go to 118 North Clark Street to Room 500 (Bus fare: $1.10) and buy Cook County receipt stamps (Cost: $3.00). Take stamps and application and questionnaire to Room 935 and submit. (If you are currently on ADC, the stamps alone cost your month's "personal essentials" budget, which is supposed to cover all transportation, phone calls, hair care, toiletries non-prescription medical items, reading materials, check-cashing fees, recreation, and other items. Thus, the bus fare must come out of money for food or children's school supplies.)

5. Next you go to Wells High School on Saturday, May 1. Be there by 9:30 or miss the exam. (Bus fare: $1.10, plus possible babysitter expenses. Applicant is not informed how long the exam will take.)

6. If you should happen to pass the exam (last time it was given, very few passed), your name goes onthe eligibility list. Then you wait to be informed when and where to appear for the following three phases: Oral/Practical Examination; Medical Examination; and fingerprinting. You are checked to see if, when, and on what charges you were arrested. If you lied on your questionnaire, you are out of luck. If arrested and you didn't lie, you may still be eligible--each case is decided on its so-called "individual merits."

7. If you made it and are hired, you will be sent to one of the "Special District Offices" where you will be put to work as Rank 1 (salary $518 to $706/mo.) worker in an ill-defined job under supervisors who have not received directions on how to use you.

During three years of research and development, Career Options has experienced one administrative stumbling block after another. Similar crises of employment, education, and training are as frequently to be found in such allied fields as mental health, teaching assistance, child care, and social service below the academic level of Master's Degree in Social Work (M.S.W.). It seems that while New Careers are desirable in theory, the hiring practices are tradition-bound to exclude the lesser trained from working alongside the professionals. As Sidney Zimbalist and Claire M. Anderson point out in their study, "The Social Welfare Manpower Crisis Revisited" (The Social Service Review, Vol. 44, No. 4):

> Despite the common lip service given to differential deployment of staff and to "new careers" objectives, substantial trends in this

direction were not seen in the data from this study. A relatively small number of individual agencies were experimenting with promising patterns of diversified staffing, such as team structures, but for the most part these developments had not spread very far. Obviously, a tremendous task lies ahead if social agencies are to retool for broader utilization of personnel.

Those educational programs which are being rapidly expanded for social welfare workers at the junior college level--and perhaps even those at the bachelor's level as well—may therefore be "jumping the gun." Most operating agencies appeared to be on one track, with their sights set on recruiting increasing numbers of MSW workers, while schools that are rapidly turning out paraprofessional workers are on another. The prospect of a collision looms ahead if agencies are not adequately prepared to provide meaningful employment and career lines for the products of these training programs. The Illinois State Employment Service has for some time been classifying social welfare work at the level below the master's degree as a "surplus occupation," with many more applicants than openings. This apparent training gap between schools and agencies is being increasingly noted in recent literature.

It seems clear that there is urgent need--at the national and local levels--for schools, agencies, and professional associations to communicate and collaborate more closely in the planning and implementation of training and employment programs. Intensive work with operating agencies is essential to assist them in restructuring their programs for differential staff deployment if the objectives of "new careers" and manpower diversification are to be soon realized. Otherwise, serious discrepancies may arise between manpower demand and supply in the social services--at a time when there are dilemmas enough in the helping disciplines without creating new ones.

Educational institutions are still the primary providers of trained paraprofessionals. However, because of the lack of articulation between educational institutions (in conjunction with paraprofessional associations) and human service employers, most qualified workers in paraprofessional positions are excluded from either academic or career advancement. In September 1970, the Junior College Board of Illinois committed a task force to determine a systematic plan of credit transfer with senior colleges. As of the summer of 1971, no results have appeared from that study, despite a recent resolution passed at the Human Services Conference in May, urging immediate action on articulation.

Because there is little or no accountability concerning New Careers programs which arise in response to Acts of Congress, because administrative behavior is so often inconsistent with legislative interpretation, and because there is little or no direct relationship between administrative efforts and legislative intention, Career Options has come to the conclusion that a thoughtful and well-designed evaluation of New Careers programs would fill this severe gap. This would call for a comprehensive and up-to-date reveiw and monitoring of manpower utilization. In this regard, we support a bill introduced by State Representative Robert Mann of Illinois, to establish a legislative Employment Program Evaluation Commission. Here is his rationale for what we believe to be an exemplary action to ensure consistency between legislative rhetoric and administrative behavior:

> In comparison to other states, Illinois is far behind in effective utilization of para-professionals both in welfare and other areas. Efforts to increase the number of medical par-professionals were further delayed recently as an Illinois Senate committee defeated Senator Robert Coulson's bill to provide for the licensing of "medical assistants." The State of California recently passed similar legislation. It is highly important that goups concerned with creating new career opitons exert greater pressure in Springfield in order to pass this type of needed legislation.
>
> Just as the implementation of "new careers" programs needs review, so too does our entire network of employment programs in the state. With the federal government's increased emphasis on work requirements and job training programs for the poor, it is particularly important that present programs be evaluated before more money is thown into new and expanded programs. Though I strongly disagree that we must force the poor to work, I am concerned that existing and future employment programs truly meet their needs. We must therefore ask a series of important questions. How many of the poor do current programs actually serve? Does training lead to a job, or do present programs raise only false expectations? Do available jobs lead to advancement, or are they only dead-end? We need a clearer picture of current training programs, manpower forecast, and what public and private responsibility for training and employing people should be.
>
> In order to answer these questions, to evaluate present programs, and to make needed recommendations, I have introduced a bill (H.B. 831) in the Illinois legislature that would establish a legislative Employment Program Evaluation Commission. The Commission would evaluate

both private and public employment programs in the State in an attempt to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of these programs. The Commission would place particular emphasis on the feasibility of programs embodying the new careers concept. The Commission would also focus on the administration of present programs and the possible centralization of adminstrative structures. In vetoing the 1970 Employment and Manpower Act, President Nixon himself stated that legislation was needed that would pull together the present unrelated, narrowly targeted manpower training programs. Employment programs are now run by a confusing number of governmental and private agencies from the U.S. Dept. of Labor and the Illinois Department of Public Aid to the Illinois State Employment Service and the Social and Rehabilitation Service of H.E.W.. As a result, *no* organization is easily held accountable for the inadequacies of present programs. We undoubtedly need greater coordination of employment programs as one means of making them more responsive to the needs of the poor. (Keynote speech to Conference on Human Services Curriculum, Prairie State College, May 6, 1971).

This document is written in the interest of informing and perhaps enlightening other pilot projects to come. We therefore conclude with an advisory model of "grantsmanship," to ensure productive and sustained administration of programs and services funded under Acts of Congress. Only in this way will everyone receive quality for each dollar invested.

Let's face it!

As long as money is scarce, as long as the U.S. Government continues to fund projects, and as long as a great number of projects all compete for government money, those projects competing for grants will always be tempted to promise more programs and services for less of the grantor's money. The game is for the grantor to offer less and the grantee to offer more, each bluffing the other with rewards and punishments.

For those who are serious about their work, and consequently care a great deal about the quality of their results, we recommend the "Money Back Guarantee Grant" for programs and services. Technically, all grantors reserve the right to withdraw, withhold, disallow, or otherwise discontinue funding if the grantee is not delivering as agreed. However, these options are more often politically motivated. If the goals and objectives of the project, or the terms and conditions of the grant, are not mutually clear, they are seldom reasons for discontinuing the grant money.

The "Money Back Guarantee" is a time-honored American tradition to ensure quality performance from programs, services, and products. Convinced of its effectiveness, we strongly advise the following measures to be taken when allowing grants for the administration of programs and services.

1. Under the "Money Back Guarantee," the grantor must demand from the grantee a guarantee of workmanship/performance. Terms of the guarantee must be specific in every detail. Grantee must reserve his right to appeal. In the case of the grantor's failure to support as specifically agreed, the grantee must be compensated for the loss of time or commitment. This guarantee must be so written as to cause each party to be honest and realistic with themselves, to be responsible and accountable for only those tasks that they can actually perform. Career Options feels that its contract with the government has lacked this quality of mutual guarantee or assurance.

2. In order to achieve a measure of seriousness, satisfaction, and productivity, a one-to-one accountability relationship must be established between the grantor and grantee, *i.e.*, between the contract officer (representing the grantor) and project director (representing the grantee). This relationship should exist between the same two people throughout the entire contract or grant period. In the less than three years of the Career Options project, official business that was legitimately between the contract officer and the project director was variously handled by seven people on the YMCA staff, and by equally as many people at the U.S. Office of Education at different times and at different levels. At the time of this writing, the contract officer function is in transit, owing to "administrative reorganization."

3. Complete and thorough program auditing is essential for any satisfactory and productive relationship between grantor and grantee. In nearly three years of the project, Career Options had only two visits by the contract officer. These were more on the order of diplomatic or protocol visits. No serious review was made of work records, no on-site inspection of research, curriculum development, or evaluative activities. Thus, Career Options further recommends periodic face-to-face accounting, review, resolution, and resettlement of duties and responsibilities between grantor and grantee.

4. The grantee has the responsibility of keeping complete and accurate records--both programmatic and financial, to facilitate internal auditing by the grantee, and monitoring by the grantor. Progress reports and annual fiscal and status reports are to be seriously treated by both parties. Career Options has never received any sort of note from the grantor even acknowledging receipt of reports, much less responding to the contents thereof.

5. Contracts and grants should be made from date to date, with no provision for renewal. The experience of the Career Options project has shown that the annual ritual of contract renewal or continuation tends to be wasteful and pointless. It only serves to reinforce the fact that the grantor still holds the money, and therefore, the upper hand. It forces the grantee to propose all over again what the grantor wants to read and hear and the gaming effect sets in once more. Career Options strongly endorses contracting from date to date, so as to eliminate the time-consuming games of grant renewal or continuation.

6. At the outset, a New Careers grant should state in operational terms the results that will be achieved, and specify the jobs to be performed to attain them. Because of the complex tasks involved in the building of New Careers, it is virtually impossible to conduct, for example, research as versus development, demonstration as versus experimentation, pilot project as versus program of implementation or ongoing operation. In the course of the Career Options project, numerous debates occurred between representatives of the grantor and grantee, each attempting to define what research is, for example, to the extent of overlooking the original goals and objectives.

   Moreover, both grantor and grantee were under pressure to "stay in line," to keep the project one of educational research, rather than to let it stray into manpower training such as is funded by the Labor Department. This obviously reflects inter-agency rivalry at the highest level, rendering cooperation, time, and money-saving almost impossible.

   Career Options advises that for future grants, the practicality of earmarking funds for New Careers organizations be considered. Earmarking such funds would be in the interest of all parties, encouraging them to make the best use of both the providers and educators of human services. In this case, the New

Careerists themselves might act as prime contractor, to purchase educational and employment subcontract services as a way of ensuring the best quality for their money.

In conclusion, the experience of the Career Options project has shown that New Careers programs are new, untried, and indeed, complex. They require the concerted efforts of employers, employees, educators, clients, students, functionaries of citizen groups, community organizations, advocates representing professional associations and technical unions. Such programs call for massive coordination, commitment, and continuity. Otherwise, time and money is wasted in scattered projects under separate funding sources and jurisdictions.

The national jobless rate, at the time of this writing, is 6.4 percent, extending to 25 percent and above among blacks and minorities. Even the trained and educated from high schools and colleges are frustrated by the no-job prospect. As a national response, $5.5 billion has been set aside by Congress to create jobs in the public sector alone. This would immediately provide work for 150,000 people. Critics have already dubbed this a WPA leaf-raking, make-work program to inflate the federal budget, create waste in haste. They say a federal project like this can only be short-lived. We at Career Options advise and urge serious attention to:

1. Hiring first, then training or retraining people for jobs which are truly productive, lasting, and which have personal satisfaction and societal benefits.
2. Ensuring administrative accountability of any federally funded project, subject to public review and revision, as well as a detailed "money-back guarantee" to insure quality.
3. Ensure continuity and coordination among all parties to the same grant or contract, subject to "money-back guarantee."

In the long run, it must be remembered that New Careers was intended for the poor, and the poor quickly embraced it--believing, trusting, and expecting to break out of the "no-opportunity system." But the poor really have not had a part in the decision-making process of the programs that affect them; nor have they been substantially benefited. What they demanded from HEW, OEO, and Labor in September of 1969 still remain to be seen in September of 1971.